

Cornwall 4.1-30
Appl. No. 10/755,988
Amdt. dated January 4, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2005

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 4 and 5. Figures 4 and 5 have been labeled "Prior Art" as suggested by the Examiner. These sheets, which include Figures 4 and 5, replace the original sheets including Figures 4 and 5.

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Amendment, Claims 1 to 4, 7 to 11, 13 to 15 and 18 to 27 are pending in the application. Claims 5, 6, 12, 16, and 17 have been cancelled. Claims 19 to 24 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 25 to 27 are new. No claims have been allowed.

Independent Claim 1 has been amended to call for the relief vent to be connected to the branch pipe at a point between the stack and the fixture. In addition, the relief vent has been further defined as venting the gas from the branch pipe into the air outside of and surrounding the relief vent. The positioning of the relief vent is shown in Figure 1 and the flow of gas through the relief vent to the surrounding air is shown in Figure 3.

Independent Claim 10 has been amended to include the limitation of Claim 11. Claim 10 as amended calls for the relief vent and the air admittance valve to be connected to the branch pipe at a common point between the fixture and the stack. Dependent Claim 11 has been amended to further define the relief vent and the air admittance valve as being connected to the branch pipe by a connector pipe. New dependent Claim 25 depends from Claim 11 and defines the connector pipe as a Y-connector. New dependent Claim 26 depends from Claim 8 and calls for the relief vent and the air admittance valve to be connected to the branch pipe by a connector pipe. Dependent Claim 27 depends from Claim 26 and defines the connector pipe as a Y-connector. Support for these claims is found in paragraph 26 of the specification and in Figure 1.

In the Office Action

(1) The drawings were objected under 37 CFR 1.83(a) as not showing every feature of the claimed invention. The reference to the drain opening in Claims 1 and 10 has been deleted. Claims 5, 6, 16 and 17 have been cancelled.

(2) The drawings were objected to because Figures 4 and 5 should have been designated by a legend -Prior Art-. A proposed drawing correction is being submitted herewith to correct the drawings.

(3) The specification was objected to because of a typographical error. The specification has been amended to correct the typographical error cited by the Examiner as well as other typographical errors.

(4) Claims 1, 5 to 12 and 16 to 18 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over O'Leary (U.S. Patent No. 2,127,184) in view of Swaffield et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0261870).

O'Leary does not show or suggest the use of a relief vent. O'Leary also does not disclose, show or suggest connecting a relief vent and an air admittance valve at a common point on a branch pipe of a drainage system. Swaffield et al. shows a pressure relief device for a drainage system. In this pressure relief device, air from the drainage system enters the flexible reservoir and inflates the reservoir in case of positive pressure within the system. Thus, the air from the drainage system does not exit the relief valve to the surrounding air as set forth in amended Claim 1 of the present application. In addition, Swaffield et al. does not show or suggest connecting the relief vent and the air admittance valve at a common point on the branch pipe as set forth in amended

Cornwall 4.1-30
Appl. No. 10/755,988
Amdt. dated January 4, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2005

independent Claim 10 of the present application.


Applicant believes that amended independent Claims 1 and 10 are unobvious to one skilled in the art and patentable over O'Leary in view of Swaffield et al. Further, dependent Claims 7 to 15 and 18, as depending from patentable base Claims 1 and 10, are unobvious to one skilled in the art and patentable over the above cited references. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

(5) Claims 2 to 4 and 13 to 15 were rejected under 35 USC §103 as being unpatentable over O'Leary (U.S. Patent No. 2,127,184) in view of Cornwall (U.S. Patent No. 6,795,987). Applicant feels that in view of the discussions above with regard to independent Claims 1 and 10, dependent Claims 2 to 4 and 13 to 15, as depending from unobvious and patentable base Claims 1 and 10, are unobvious to one skilled in the art and patentable over the above cited references. Reconsideration of this rejection is requested.

Cornwall 4.1-30
Appl. No. 10/755,988
Amdt. dated January 4, 2006
Reply to Office Action of October 4, 2005

Applicant believes that Claims 1 to 4, 7 to 11, 13 to 15, 18 and 25 to 27 are now in condition for allowance. Notice of Allowance is requested.

Respectfully,


Mary M. Moyne
Registration No. 35,962

McLEOD & MOYNE, P.C.
2190 Commons Parkway
Okemos, Michigan 48864

(517) 347-4100
Facsimile: (517) 347-4103

Attachment: Drawing Replacement Sheets